

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1-30 are rejected. The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

STATEMENT ON SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

An in-person interview was conducted between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on October 19, 2004, and a telephonic interview was conducted between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on October 20, 2004. Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity to conduct the in-person interview, and the telephonic interview.

During the in-person interview, features of the present invention that patentably distinguish over the cited art were discussed, including that according to aspects of the present invention different carrier frequencies are modulated with the same input information. Other points raised at the interview are included below.

During the telephonic interview, the Examiner indicated she had discussed with the Primary Examiner the points raised at the in-person interview, and unless new art was discovered during an updated search, the Examiner would recommend the case for allowance.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-11 AND 28) UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS ANTICIPATED BY BERTSIS (U.S.P. 6,229,526)

The Examiner rejects independent claim 1 (and dependent claims 2-11 and 28) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bertsis. (Action at pages 2-5).

Independent claim 1 recites an input system including a "transmission part transmitting signals generated by having a plurality of different carrier frequencies modulated with the same input information; and a reception part receiving the transmitted signals and demodulating the signals into the same input information." (Emphasis added).

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Bertsis teaches:

. . . transmitting signals generated by having a plurality of different carrier frequencies modulated with the same input information (since) (the devices 101, 103 are the same input, because they (are) generated (by) the same controller 214)

(Action at page 2).

Applicants respectfully submit, as discussed during the in-person interview, that Bertsis does not teach, for example, frequencies modulated with the same input information. Bertsis teaches (col. 2, lines 1-5):

a control system for computer games that includes at least a pair of wireless remote control devices adapted to be used by two (or more) people

simultaneously and without interference.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Berstis teaches two or more inputs of different information, not the same information.

Further, Berstis does not teach that signals generated by the remote control devices 101 and 103 are generated by the controller 213, as the Examiner contends. While Berstis does teach (col. 9, lines 36-40) a "data processing unit also includes circuitry for receiving/decoding the control signals generated by the control devices 101 and 103," Berstis further teaches (col. 8 lines 5-10):

(e)ach of the pair of control devices is thus polled many times per second (but not simultaneously) so that, from the perspective of the pair of users, the devices are used simultaneously to control graphical elements on the display.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Berstis teaches that different information is transmitted by the different devices.

Conclusion

Since Berstis does not teach features recited in independent claim 1 (and dependent claims 2-11 and 28), the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-11, and 28 allowed.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 12, 16, 24, AND 30 (AND RESPECTIVE DEPENDENT CLAIMS 13-15, CLAIMS 17-23 AND CLAIM 29) UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS ANTICIPATED BY BERTSIS

The Examiner rejects independent claims 12, 16, 24, and 30 (and respective dependent claims 13-15, claims 17-23 and claim 29) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Berstis. (Action at pages 4-5).

Independent claims 12, 16, and 24 recite an input system and device including "a transmission part transmitting signals generated by having a plurality of different carrier frequencies modulated with the same input information." (Emphasis added).

Independent claim 30 recites "a transmission part transmitting the same input information by a plurality of carrier frequencies." (Emphasis added).

In the Office Action the Examiner contends these features are taught by Berstis as discussed in the Examiner's contentions regarding the rejection of claim 1. (Action at page 4).

As discussed during the In-person interview of October 18, 2004, Berstis does not teach transmitting the same input information. Berstis teaches (col. 2, lines 1-5) a system having "at least a pair of wireless remote control devices adapted to be used by two (or more) people simultaneously and without interference." (Emphasis added). That is, Berstis teaches two or

more inputs of different information.

Conclusion

Since Berstis does not teach features recited in independent claims 12, 16, 24, and 30 (and respective dependent claims 13-15, claims 17-23 and claim 29), the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 12-24 and 29-30 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 25, 2008

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501